



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 1, 2018

AGENDA

- 1. Perimeter Center, Subarea C – Schoedinger Funeral Home 6100 Perimeter Center
18-056FDP/CU Final Development Plan/Conditional Use**
- 2. PUD – Muirfield Village Golf Club - Memorial Tournament Headquarters
18-066AFDP 5750 Memorial Drive
Amended Final Development Plan**
- 3. PUD – I-270/Tuttle Road – McDonald’s Signs 5170 Tuttle Crossing Blvd.
18-049AFDP Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:28 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Steve Stidhem, Warren Fishman, Kristina Kennedy, Bob Miller, Jane Fox, and William Wilson. City representatives present were: Vince Papsidero, Thaddeus Boggs, Claudia Husak, Aaron Stanford, Michael Hendershot, Nichole Martin, Logan Stang, JM Rayburn, and Flora Rogers.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the September 20, 2018, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

The Chair explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said the following cases were on this Consent Agenda: Schoedinger Funeral Home, Muirfield Village Golf Club, and McDonald’s sign. She determined the cases would be heard in the following order: McDonald’s, Schoedinger, and Muirfield. The minutes are recorded in the order they are listed on the published agenda.



**1. Perimeter Center, Subarea C – Schoedinger Funeral Home 6100 Perimeter Center
18-056FDP/CU Final Development Plan/Conditional Use**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said this application is a proposal for the construction of a funeral home and associated site improvement on a site zoned Planned Commerce District, Perimeter Center, Subarea C. She said the site is north of Perimeter Drive, approximately 750 feet west of the intersection with Wall Street. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan with text modifications under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and a review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236. She said the Commission has final authority on this application and witnesses will need to be sworn in.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

Nichole Martin said the Final Development Plan is the last step in the Planned Unit Development process, which includes the final details, any Minor Text Modifications, and a Conditional Use when warranted. She said two Minor Text Modifications are being requested this evening and noted the site was zoned a PUD in 1988 which since then conditions have changed.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site. She said the site is largely open and completely undeveloped. She said there is an existing stand of trees centrally located on the site and in totality there are 63 trees, the majority of which are in fair condition. She noted an existing sidewalk along Perimeter Drive.

Ms. Martin said an approximately 12,000-square-foot funeral home is proposed, which is intended for the celebration of life so this site will not contain any cremation or embalming services. She said 87 parking spaces are proposed, which meets all Code requirements. She added there is a stormwater management basin proposed as a visual amenity along Perimeter Drive and the site will be heavily landscaped.

Ms. Martin said this proposal remains largely the same as reviewed by the Commission at the Informal Review in May 2018. She presented renderings to show the proposed architecture of the south, north, and east elevations, which is characterized as modern craftsman style comprised of traditional materials. The south elevation also includes the stormwater pond as a nice amenity feature situated along Perimeter Drive.

Ms. Martin presented the final landscape details and noted the site will be accessed from Perimeter Drive. She reported the applicant has been working with Planning and Engineering to provide shared access to any future development to the east via a cross access easement. She said the applicant has been responsive to the Commission's recommendations to add landscaping along Perimeter Drive to soften the façade of the building. She presented one illustration of a sign and said the applicant has provided the final details for signs. She said the sign is smaller than permitted by the development standards in Subarea C.

Ms. Martin said the Conditional Use request is consistent with previous Conditional Use requests and text modifications in planned districts where a permitted use of the same zoning district is already permitted. She noted Personal Services are a permitted use and the development text permits Suburban Office and Institutional uses as well. She stated the operational details as follows:

- Funeral homes are considered a Personal Service
- No cremation or embalming services are provided at this facility
- An average of two employees will be present at any given time
- A maximum of four commercial vehicles will be associated with the use

Ms. Martin concluded the Commission is being asked to make three motions this evening; specifically:

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended for two Text Modifications:

1. To include a provision to allow Personal Services as a Conditional Use within the Perimeter Center Planned Commerce District, Subarea C.
2. To eliminate the requirement for a landscape mound along the Perimeter Drive frontage only when the parking lot is located to the rear of the structure within the Perimeter Center Planned Commerce District, Subarea C.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended for a Final Development Plan with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant continue to work with Planning and Engineering to revise the plans, declaration of access easement, legal description, and exhibit to provide a cross access easement for the benefit of the subject parcel and parcel to the east to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, prior to issuance of a building permit;
- 2) That the applicant work with Staff to confirm the tree assessments prior to issuance of a tree removal permit to ensure no trees are designated incorrectly; and
- 3) That the applicant work with Staff to rectify discrepancies on the landscape plan including appropriate substitutions for the proposed Redbuds; subject to Staff approval.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended for Personal Services to be permitted as a Conditional Use with no conditions.

Bob Miller asked for confirmation that this access point will serve another site in the future. He asked what other options were considered. Ms. Martin said from the City's standpoint, Perimeter Drive is designated for improvements in the future so the City would like to keep opportunities available for shared access. She said potentially there could be medians in the future, limiting access.

Kristina Kennedy asked if consideration was given to the number of ADA accessible spaces based on the potential clientele visiting this facility. Ms. Martin explained the Zoning Code does not require any more ADA spaces than would meet the Building Code requirement.

Bill Wilson inquired about the sidewalks. Ms. Martin stated there is a sidewalk along Perimeter Drive and is located within the public right-of-way so it is not shown on the applicant's property in the proposed site plan. She said there is a concrete sidewalk proposed that would run from the building at the southeast corner entrance that then aligns with the west side of the drive and connects to that existing sidewalk on Perimeter Drive.

Warren Fishman said he would discourage the applicant from eliminating the mound as the continuity of the street will be lost. He asked if the bulk of the existing trees are in the center of the lot. He emphasized the lack of parking for funeral homes and suggested a written overflow parking agreement.

Jane Fox inquired about the traffic study. Ms. Martin clarified there was a traffic memo produced. She reported Engineering reviewed the memo and felt comfortable with it based on the comparisons made to the same use in other similar suburban communities. She said the peak time for this type of use is Sunday afternoon so this business will not place much of a burden on the rest of the street network system.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Aaron Underhill said he was an attorney with Underhill and Hodge at 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany. He said the applicant has addressed the Commission's concerns with this formal application. He reported they have had conversations with the neighboring property owner to the west and are amenable to providing some overflow parking, as needed. He indicated the neighbor would like to see the project underway and understand more about the operations before they would enter into a formal agreement. He reported the applicant reached out to both property owners on either side of the property to see if either of them would be interested in cross access and they received a firm "no" in both regards. He said the applicant is willing to put in a declaration easement on our property to provide that opportunity in the future.

Randy Schoedinger, Schoedinger Funeral Commission Service, 229 E. State Street, Columbus, OH, 43215, said he did not have the conversations with the property owner to the west but their realtor did. He said no matter how large a parking lot is built, there will come a time when more spaces are needed. He said the neighbors do not want to put anything in writing until they see what kind of neighbor Schoedinger will be.

Ms. Fox said she appreciates the landscape enhancements; from the street view, she would prefer the mounds be eliminated. She said she does not see any reason when there is an amenity as beautiful as this pond and terrace proposed that they should not be visible from the street. She recalled that the applicant had intended for this facility to also be used for community meetings and events of that sort so it would be advantageous to be able to see that, especially in suburban areas where there are a lot of commercial uses it makes sense to have flexible spaces.

Curtis Eckleberry, Advanced Civil Design, 119 Purple Leaf Lane, clarified there is a concrete sidewalk on the west side of the drive.

Ms. Kennedy complimented the applicant's team as this is a beautiful facility, it appears as if it will be peaceful, and a great addition to the community.

The Chair called for the public to speak in regards to this application. [Hearing none.] Closed the public portion of the meeting.

Mr. Fishman restated he disagreed with Ms. Fox about the mounding. Ms. Fox said mounding is used to disguise an area that is unattractive. She agreed that sometimes mounding can create an attractive streetscape.

Mr. Miller told the applicants they did an awesome job. He said he loved the building, loved the project, and appreciated the additional landscaping and added this is needed in the community. He recalled the message the Commission provided at the Informal Review that was to remove the mound and not hide the beautiful landscape, pond, and building.

Victoria Newell said she agreed with Ms. Fox as well. She said the mounding would detract from the overall site.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve two Minor Text Modifications:

1. To include a provision to allow Personal Services as a Conditional Use within the Perimeter Center Planned Commerce District, Subarea C.
2. To eliminate the requirement for a landscape mound along the Perimeter Drive frontage only when the parking lot is located to the rear of the structure within the Perimeter Center Planned Commerce District, Subarea C.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

The Chair asked the applicant if they agreed to the three conditions applied to the approval of the Final Development Plan, to which Mr. Underhill answered affirmatively.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve a Final Development Plan with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant continue to work with Planning and Engineering to revise the plans, declaration of access easement, legal description, and exhibit to provide a cross access easement for the benefit of the subject parcel and parcel to the east to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, prior to issuance of a building permit;
- 2) That the applicant work with Staff to confirm the tree assessments prior to issuance of a tree removal permit to ensure no trees are designated incorrectly; and
- 3) That the applicant work with Staff to rectify discrepancies on the landscape plan including appropriate substitutions for the proposed Redbuds; subject to Staff approval.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve a Conditional Use with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

2. PUD – Muirfield Village Golf Club - Memorial Tournament Headquarters 18-066AFDP 5750 Memorial Drive Amended Final Development Plan

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said this application is a proposal for the demolition of the existing tournament headquarters facility and its replacement with a two-story, office and storage facility for the Muirfield Village Golf Club. She said the site is zoned Planned Unit Development District and Muirfield Village is north of Memorial Drive, approximately 450 feet northeast of the intersection with Kinross Court. She said this is a request for a review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050. She stated the Commission has final authority on this application and witnesses will have to be sworn in.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission in regards to this case.

JM Rayburn presented an aerial view of the site, which is a 33-acre-parcel that includes the existing golf course and he highlighted the area of focus this evening. He presented an aerial view image of the headquarters facility, which he noted has substantial vegetation on the western edge of the property line and features a landscaped island that runs along the service road that provides screening. He added other clubhouse facilities are located northwest of this structure. He presented photographs of the northwest and southwest elevations of the existing building. He said the proposed building will be located on the same site.

Mr. Rayburn presented the proposed site plan that includes a more defined asphalt parking area, which is oriented north of the building and extends north to the service road. He said the parking lot is proposed to contain nine parking spaces as well as one ADA-compliant space. He said the proposed site improvements show the removal of the existing landscape island in between the parking lot and the

service road. He said the existing landscape island ensures proper screening buffer to the neighboring residential properties north of the site. Therefore, he said, the applicant will have to revise the proposed site layout to include the existing landscape island as it provides important screening. He said the applicant has indicated tree removal and will be required to work with Staff on replacing trees in accordance with the Code.

Mr. Rayburn presented a three-dimensional massing image of the proposed building as well as proposed elevations as viewed from each corner. He said the proposed architecture will be integral to the existing aesthetics of the current buildings on the site. He said the proposed exterior materials match the existing stucco, stone, windows, railings, and wood shake shingles.

Mr. Rayburn reported that Staff has reviewed this application against the Amended Final Development Plan criteria and approval is recommended with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant revise the proposed site layout to retain the existing landscape island in between the parking lot and the service road;
- 2) That the applicant work with Staff to replace trees removed in accordance with Code;
- 3) That the applicant revise the proposed landscape plan to include proposed landscaping within the existing landscape island; and
- 4) That the applicant revise the proposed landscape plan to show a medium or large deciduous tree of at least two caliper inches in the parking lot island near the ADA-compliant parking space.

Jane Fox noted there are 8 to 10 trees on the northeast side of which she cannot distinguish the sizes but it seems as if there is no construction planned there so she asked why they would need to be removed. She asked, if the training facility is used by the public that would be driving to this building. She asked what kind of trees are planted in the existing landscape island. Mr. Rayburn said it is mixed with deciduous and evergreen trees. She noted the existing structure is one story and the proposed building will be two stories. She asked if Staff had considered the effects of the lighting on the adjacent neighborhood.

Bob Miller asked if the two to three residences adjacent to this property were notified of this application, to which Mr. Rayburn answered affirmatively.

Warren Fishman said he is a member of the Muirfield Village Golf Club so he consulted the attorney. The advice he received was that since he not on a committee involved in this building at all, there would be no reason to excuse himself.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Teri Umbarger, Mood Nolan, 300 Spruce Street, said the existing trees on the northeast are being removed because there is a high mound at that location that needs to be reduced due to the grading needed for the new building. She said there will no people driving to this building; Staff and members would be currently parked. She clarified there is a mix of trees planted in the landscape island. She indicated the lighting on the proposed building will be kept fairly minimal and is down more near the pedestrian level, near the doors. She said the lights for the garage door on the west side of the site might be needed for the one week during the Memorial Tournament.

Ms. Fox noted there are 9 parking spaces and 10 staff members. She said it would be nice to have a space for all the designated office workers. Ms. Umbarger said the people currently working at the facility now, those spaces would be covered with the original parking lot and these would be additional spaces to that. She said there are people going back and forth between the buildings as well so it is a standard walk so 9 spaces are adequate.

Mr. Fishman said this proposal is an incredible improvement over the current building and a lovely facility of that type.

The Chair invited the public to speak. [Hearing none.] She continued the Commission's comments.

Steve Stidhem said he thought the proposal looked great and certainly a significant upgrade from the existing structures.

Ms. Fox encouraged the applicant to use good evergreen screening.

Ms. Umbarger said one of the reasons the applicant removed the island in the design was the one week a year, there will be semi-trucks and other staging areas that are required so for maneuverability and such, there needs to be more of a clear opening to stage all of the activities. She said the applicant intends on putting sleeves in the ground to provide a buffer fencing to hide the big trucks, etc. from the neighbors to the north. She noted one of the conditions is to bring part of the island back of which the applicant has concerns from an operation standpoint. She referred to the north end of the service road that abuts the neighbors. She suggested if the service road was brought down 3 to 5 feet, they could provide more landscape buffering on that edges of the service road and still eliminate the island. She asked that the Commission consider that as well. Ms. Fox said she thought that was a reasonable compromise. Mr. Miller said he thought that was an awesome suggestion from Ms. Umbarger.

Mr. Rayburn started to revise the conditions to eliminate one or two of them.

Even though the public portion of the meeting had been closed earlier, a member of the public requested to address the Commission. The Chair asked her to come forward so she could swear her in.

Kim Hobbenstein 5784 Levin Links Court, so she is the neighbor to the north of this site. She said the Club had done a great job communicating about this project. She said they had discussed options with them about removing the barrier, shrinking the barrier, or keeping it there. She said they have been great to work with. She stated that on her property, they have a back driveway that goes to that service road, originally built for golf carts. She indicated that even if there was landscaping added to the service road, there is no way to block the view and not block the driveway so she requested the Board consider keeping the island in its current space versus adding landscaping to the north side, which will make their driveway ineffective.

Vince Papsidero said it might be best to condition this so Staff can work with the applicant and residents to figure out the correct solution. He said we cannot design the site plan on the dais.

Mr. Fishman said this neighbor should not have her driveway going to this service road, which is a private drive and he cannot imagine how her driveway was ever approved. Ms. Hobbenstein said she does not know the history of the house, etc.

Dan Sullivan, 5750 Memorial Drive, explained the back driveway was put in place by the previous owner of that house. He said they built it so that their golf carts could come over at the end of a round and entertain, using it solely for entertainment. He added the Club would come over and service the house for food and beverage so over years, as other residents have moved into the house it has just been left there without us providing any access to the property – the current resident. He said it is a legacy situation.

Mr. Fishman said it seems this proposal is a win win, if they move the road away from the house and add landscaping that would be better than putting in an island and still leaving exposure to the house.

There was a brief discussion as to how this should be handled with the neighbor in mind.

Ms. Fox suggested the Commission allow Staff and the residents to work this out and not necessarily add conditions. She said Muirfield should be allowed to utilize their private drive and parking lot to the best use possible for their needs during tournament week while being sensitive to the screening needs and buffering to the adjacent community.

The discussion continued briefly about how the conditions should be revised as the other two homeowners to the north are not present, etc.

The Chair called for a motion.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with the adjacent property owners to the north to provide additional landscape screening, subject to Staff approval;
- 2) That the applicant work with Staff to replace trees removed in accordance with Code; and
- 3) That the applicant revise the proposed landscape plan to show a medium or large deciduous tree of at least two caliper inches in the parking lot island near the ADA-compliant parking space.

*Teri Umbarger agreed to the above conditions.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

3. PUD – I-270/Tuttle Road – McDonald’s Signs 18-049AFDP

5170 Tuttle Crossing Blvd. Amended Final Development Plan

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said this application is a proposal for a wall sign and menu boards for an existing McDonald’s. She said the site is zoned Planned Unit Development, I-270/Tuttle Road, Subarea A4 and is north of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, approximately 200 feet northeast of the intersection with Blazer Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan with a Minor Text Modification under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050. She stated the Commission has the final authority on this application and witnesses will have to be sworn in.

The Chair swore in anyone intending on addressing this Commission on this case.

Warren Fishman asked Staff to clarify where exactly the sign is and its size. Logan Stang answered the wall sign will be installed in the same location as the existing wall sign, on the west elevation that faces towards the parking lot and intersection. He said the sign will be installed at the same height, the size will be slightly smaller and it meets all applicable Code provisions.

Kristina Kennedy asked about McDonald’s brand sign on the side of the building. She asked if that was a new change for Dublin or if other locations had changed out their signs as well. Mr. Stang answered this is the first one; the Perimeter Center McDonald’s that was before the Commission on September 20, 2018, does not have wall signs. He said they have two ground signs, instead. He said the other McDonald’s location in Dublin is on Bridge Street, near the Kroger plaza. He said they have also submitted an application and that is to review their signs holistically for that site so this is the first McDonald’s in Dublin to change out their wall sign.

William Wilson inquired about the drive-thru ordering system and confirmed it is to be replaced. Mr. Stang said there is a pre-browse menu that is shown on the site plans, however, that is being removed at

the request of Staff and is the first condition tied to this application. He affirmed there will just be the single menu board sign where the existing sign is located. Mr. Wilson asked if this board would be the same as the one that was already approved by this Commission and Mr. Stang answered affirmatively.

Jane Fox asked about the existing menu board sign and if it was internally illuminated as well. Mr. Stang confirmed it was internally illuminated.

The Chair noted the applicant is here this evening but nobody from the public has acknowledged that they would like to speak on this case. She called for a motion, of which there will be two.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve a Minor Text Modification:

1. To modify the development text; under Subarea A4, Parking sub-section, provision 1, to state: The site shall supply 81 parking spaces, which will service both the restaurant and the 6,000-square-foot rear building.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Mr. Stang said the applicant was available to discuss the conditions.

Rebecca Green, Permit Solutions, representing McDonald's on this particular case. She asked if these five conditions were the same applied to the Perimeter Loop menu board sign. Mr. Stang answered conditions two through five were but condition one was specific to this site.

Jacob Alber, construction manager for McDonald's in central Ohio, said the plans show two boards in this instance and the board that Staff is identifying as a pre-browse board was actually a second board, which the applicant calls a tandem drive-thru sign.

The Chair indicated that based on the information Mr. Alber just expressed, which is something different than what was included in the packet materials, she would like to hear the whole presentation.

Mr. Fishman said he thought that first, small sign, would be removed. Mr. Alber said it is a different board in itself; it is not a pre-browse, which is an actual order monitor itself. He said there will be two monitors and two menu boards to permit two cars to order at the same time.

Mr. Stang presented the drive-thru area and noted the first menu board sign and the second location also being a full menu board. Mr. Alber explained it is one lane and if a car pulls in with nobody there, they will pull up to the closest one to the window and if a second car pulls in behind the first car, they can go ahead and order at the same time to get cars through more quickly.

Ms. Green said the current menu board is 40 square feet in size and both of the proposed signs are 18.4 square feet in size.

Ms. Fox asked the applicant if they had issues with cars stacking up at this location. Mr. Alber answered at peak hours they do and it is a tight site. He said having the second sign would significantly increase the speed at which the applicant could move patrons through and off of the lot.

Ms. Fox asked Staff what the Code permits. Mr. Stang said this would be the first drive-thru in Dublin that has the two menu board signs for one lane. He said the best comparison he could give would be the Tim Hortons and Wendy's, which is located at Perimeter, as the two entities each have a separate menu board sign on one site. He stated there is nothing in the Code that prohibits more than one menu board

sign and within the Development Text for this planned district, there is a provision that grants the Commission the right to approve menu board signs that defer from standard Code requirements.

Bob Miller requested confirmation that the amount of square footage for the two proposed signs is less than the size of the single existing sign to which Mr. Stang responded in the affirmative.

The Chair asked to modify the first of the five conditions identified.

Mr. Stang asked for clarification. The Chair indicated the Commission as a whole was supportive of the two menu board signs as they would be smaller than the current sign.

Mr. Stang showed the modified condition list that removed the first condition leaving four remaining conditions.

Steve Stidhem said the Commission has not seen the first one in production yet and it is tough to now justify a second implementation of the same thing, and in fact, a double rendition of it for one site. He inquired about the timeline for getting the first menu board sign implemented.

Mr. Alber answered they could do that one fairly quickly and avoid the winter months as replacing sidewalks require certain temperatures. He added these signs are actually being installed before the one at Perimeter Loop as there are additional issues at that other site.

Mr. Miller asked about enforcement. He said the condition states the menu board sign shall contain no continuous movement, flashing, scrolling video, or animation. He asked how the City can enforce that.

Mr. Papsidero answered Code Enforcement would be checking on the signs. He reported Council just approved our Part-time Code Enforcement Officer to become Full-time, which makes three full-time Code Enforcement Officers plus there are two Zoning Inspectors in Planning.

Ms. Fox asked if the second sign would not be obvious from the right-of-way, which Mr. Stang answered affirmatively.

Mr. Wilson inquired about the type of base the menu boards would have and if they included speakers and a microphone.

Mr. Alber described the modular mounting structure will be bolted to a concrete foundation with a separate pedestal for a speaker post.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve an Amended Final Development Plan with four conditions:

- 1) That the menu board sign contain no continuous movement, flashing, scrolling video, or animation, except for the customer order image, which shall not exceed more than 20% of the menu board sign area;
- 2) That the menu board sign be turned off during non-operational business hours;
- 3) That the menu board sign not contain any additional speakers or sound; and
- 4) That the pre-set content of the menu board sign change no more than three times per day.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Communications

Claudia Husak said JM has prepared a pamphlet, which will be shared with those from Council and this Commission participating on the tour tomorrow. She noted what is included are the stops or drive-bys with a departure of 9:00 am, November 2, 2018. She said Council will be holding a meeting afterwards to reconvene and discuss what the impressions were of the tour mainly because when Council gets together, it is a public meeting so it will need to be held in the Council Chambers to include any public that might like to attend.

Ms. Husak said the Commission meeting scheduled for November 8, 2018, has been cancelled mainly because there are not enough agenda items with meetings back to back so they were all included on the November 1 meeting. She said the last meeting of the year is scheduled for December 6, 2018.

Ms. Husak said there have been some issues with the technology for members obtaining the materials for review. She reported the City's Information Technology Department is updating a lot of technology Administrative Orders that are in effect for us and will also have a training session at the December meeting and to also introduce the new Administrative Order for technology use and use of assets.

Ms. Husak said materials have traditionally been stored in several areas for Boards and the Commission to access but Staff is moving toward just having materials located on the website.

Vince Papsidero said the Clerk's office is moving everything to OneDrive for Council.

Jane Fox said she accesses everything off the City's website but for whatever is not on there, if staff could send the Agenda and the Minutes in an email that is just so easy for them. Steve Stidhem said he prefers OneDrive as he uses it all the time and it is easy. Ms. Husak explained that Staff uses OneDrive too but because everything is being saved in multiple locations and for process improvement, Staff is taking out some duplicate steps that might make things easier. She added there are record retention requirements as well so it is not as easy as just having everything on OneDrive.

Ms. Husak said there will be some staffing changes coming in 2019 as City Council has requested that the Boards and Commission work be handled by the Clerk of Council's office, which is done in many municipalities in the region. Starting in January, she said the Clerk's office will be staffing the PZC, ARB, and BZA meetings. She clarified the facilitation of the meetings and the minutes will be handled through the Clerk's office but everything else will remain with Planning Staff.

Ms. Fox said Council has been talking about the Operating Budget and she was hoping to get the Commission's input on suggestions on improving and increasing the education for Commission members. She said Ms. Newell is going to be leaving and as others begin to leave and new people come onboard, the historic and experienced Commissioners leave a lot of expertise to be lost. In order to bring Commissioners up to the level of the best Commissioners possible, she asked as an education program is being built, if there were suggestions on how that should happen. She suggested a web-based program that Commissioners could access at their leisure, bringing in more consultants, or taking advantage of more educational opportunities at conferences.

Kristina Kennedy said, as a busy working mom, who travels for work and has night video conferences, it is really hard to break away sometimes for additional meetings with Council but she would be supportive of web-based learning.

Warren Fishman said he agreed and would also like to hear the visions of Council. Ms. Fox agreed it is important for the PZC and the ARB to hear directly from Council what direction needs to be taken and why.

Bill Wilson suggested that workshops occur when there are cancelled meetings due to the lack of cases ready to be heard.

Steve Stidhem said he liked that idea but also wanted to suggest discussing simulations of fiction cases, talk through scenarios such as private roads, etc. He also suggested shadowing opportunities and for prospective Commission members to listen to meetings prior to considering a position to see what they would be getting into.

Several members on the Commission agreed with Mr. Stidhem's suggestion.

Mr. Fishman recalled people that anticipated becoming members attended meeting two to three months before they were appointed.

Ms. Fox said she thinks Council needs the input from the Commission as well, as the power of the PZC is extremely strong.

Victoria Newell said reading the Commissioner's Handbook is a valuable tool. She said it might behoove Staff to take the Zoning Code by Section and review it at the end of a regular meeting in conjunction with how it is being enforced with our Community Plan. She said it is so important for Commissioners to understand fully what the Code states.

Kristina Kennedy asked if for evenings when the meetings end early, if there could be education chunks that are prepared and in the queue so members could take 30 minutes and look at something like a section of the Code or other relevant topic.

Jane Fox agreed that was a great idea. Steve Stidhem said he liked the idea of, "hip pocket training". Warren Fishman added the training could occur when there is no meeting scheduled.

Mr. Papsidero said Staff would set up a Survey Monkey for the Commission that would be topical to provide Staff with the priorities and then they could plan for topics that are relevant and important to the Commission and not necessarily from Staff's perspective.

Ms. Fox said it might be a fun exercise for Planners to show them how they approach an application; members could shadow a Planner and learn so much from that.

Ms. Kennedy said she was interested in going back to old cases to review to see for herself if she had made the right decision at the time like for the type of materials approved.

Thad Boggs said he does not advise going back to old cases in that way, but there could be a field tour as a group for an hour or 90 minutes to see the Commission's decisions that came to fruition and then come back to chambers for another hour and discuss what was liked and disliked about projects. He said especially for the times when otherwise the meeting would be cancelled so Staff is not calling special meetings for training.

Ms. Kennedy said she loved that concept.

Ms. Fox said she would be interested in focusing on signs and materials, etc. because the Commission does not always get to see the physical material and they should. She thanked Planning for having the context pictures this evening as those are so helpful. She said everyone should have a full copy of the Zoning Code and if they do not, to contact Planning.

Claudia Husak said the problem with giving the Commission members a copy of the book is it is not ever updated. She said the last update was the addition of the Historic South District when in the BSD Code, earlier this year or late last year. Ms. Fox suggested supplements could always be provided. Staff agreed.

Adjournment

The Chair, Victoria Newell, asked if there were any further items to discuss. [Hearing none.] She adjourned the meeting at 8:34 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on December 6, 2018.